UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/596,377	09/04/2007	Kevin S. Davies	06-384	5901	
	7590 11/24/200 LAPOINTE, P.C.	EXAMINER			
900 CHAPEL S		LEE, DOUGLAS S			
SUITE 1201 NEW HAVEN,	CT 06510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2121		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/24/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summany		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/596,377	DAVIES, KEVIN S.					
Office Action Summary			Examiner	Art Unit				
			DOUGLAS S. LEE	2121				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ddress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE Masions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum street or reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IAILING DAT of 37 CFR 1.136 nunication. atutory period will will, by statute, ca	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO (a). In no event, however, may a reply be till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this control (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·			
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	nd on 23 July	, 2009					
-	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 July 2009</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)	/ 							
<u>ا</u>	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-53</u> is/are pending in the a	application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1.2,25,26 and 28-31</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) <u>3-24,27 and 32-53</u> is/are ol	=						
′=	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	-	election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
	The specification is objected to by th	o Evaminar						
, —	The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 June 200</u> 6			by the Eveniner				
10)23	Applicant may not request that any obje	_	•	•				
					ED 1 121/d\			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119	o by the Exam	minor reto tro attacrica office	, rection of form i	10 102.			
	<u>-</u>	.	'- ' 051100 0 1440/-) (-1) - (6)				
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (t).				
a)	a) ☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).								
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen			🗖					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	PTO-9481	4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D					
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	.0 070)	5) 🔲 Notice of Informal F					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:								

Art Unit: 2121

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment and Arguments

Applicant's amendments (added new claims 30-53) arguments (claims 1-53) filed 7/23/2009 (regarding claim 4 rejection 35 USC 112; claims 1, 28, and 29 rejections 35 USC 102(e) Lindstrom (US Pat. No. 6,644,080); claims 2, 25, and 26 rejections 35 USC 103(a)) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive in part. The office maintained the rejections of claims 1, 28, and 29 35 USC 102(e) Lindstrom (US Pat. No. 6,644,080) and claims 2, 25, and 26 rejections 35 USC 103(a). Claims 3-24, 27, and 32-53 are objected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 1. Claims 1, 28, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lindstrom (US Pat. #6,644,080).

Regarding claim 1, Lindstrom discloses a control system for use with a machine having a tool arranged to move through a known path of movement, the control system characterized by comprising: a means for detecting the location of objects in or adjacent the path of the tool (col. 6, lines 10-35, element 48); and a processing and control means arranged to determine the distance between the objects in or adjacent the path of the tool and a leading edge of the tool (col. 6, lines 10-35, element 18); wherein the control system includes a first mode of operation in which the processing and control means controls movement of the tool such that the distance

Art Unit: 2121

between the objects in or adjacent the path of the tool and the leading edge of the tool is maintained within minimum and maximum values (col. 6, lines 10-35).

Regarding claim 28, Lindstrom discloses the processing and control means comprises a software program residing on a digital signal processor (col.5, lines 25-35).

Regarding claim 29, Lindstrom discloses wherein the minimum value is set to zero such that the tool approaches the objects when the distance between the objects in or adjacent the path of the tool and the leading edge of the tool is greater than the maximum value but does not retract away from the objects (col. 8, lines 1-21).

Regarding claim 30, this method claim is rejected for the same reasons applied above rejected system claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 2121

4. Claims 2, 25, 26 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindstrom (US Pat. #6,644,080) in view of Appleyard (US Pat. 6,903,327) and Chen et al. (US Pat. #6,122,023).

Regarding claim 2, the sole difference between this claim and Lindstrom is the processing and control means such that the processing and control means recognizes the presence of obstructions in the region by the images received by the light receiving means. However, Appleyard discloses processing and control means such that the processing and control means recognizes the presence of obstructions in the region by the images received by the light receiving means. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use such processing and control means recognizes the presence of obstructions in the region by the images received by the light receiving means in order to improve the overall safety system for an industrial press.

Regarding claims 25 and 26, the difference between this claim and modified Lindstrom is the light emitting means which includes a laser diode and the current through the laser diode is modulated to create varying speckle patterns and thereby improve resolution of the received image. Chen et al. disclose the light emitting means which includes a laser diode and the current through the laser diode is modulated to create varying speckle patterns and thereby improve resolution of the received image. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use such the light emitting means which includes a laser diode and the current through the laser diode is modulated to create varying speckle patterns and thereby improve resolution of the received image in order to improve the overall the resolution of the images by eliminating speckle.

Art Unit: 2121

Regarding claim 31, this method claim is rejected for the same reasons applied above rejected system claim 2.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3-24, 27 and 32-53 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Douglas Lee, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3745. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

Art Unit: 2121

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady, can be reached on (571) 272-3819 or via e-mail addressed to [albert.decady@uspto.gov]. The fax number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [doug.lee@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

Art Unit: 2121

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (in USA or CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. S. L./ Examiner, Art Unit 2121

/Albert DeCady/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2121